arXiv:1603.03857v1 [math.AP] 12 Mar 2016

MINIMAL GRAPHS IN THE HYPERBOLIC SPACE WITH SINGULAR ASYMPTOTIC BOUNDARIES

QING HAN, WEIMING SHEN, AND YUE WANG

Abstract. We study asymptotic behaviors of solutions f to the Dirichlet problem for minimal graphs in the hyperbolic space with singular asymptotic boundaries under the assumption that the boundaries are piecewise regular with positive curvatures. We derive an estimate of such solutions by the corresponding solutions in the intersections of interior tangent balls. The positivity of curvatures plays an important role.

1. Introduction

Assume that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded domain. Lin [11] studied the Dirichlet problem of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta f - \frac{f_i f_j}{1+|\nabla f|^2} f_{ij} + \frac{n}{f} = 0 \quad &\text{in } \Omega, \\ f = 0 \quad &\text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ f > 0 \quad &\text{in } \Omega. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

Geometrically, the graph of f is a minimal surface in $\mathbb{H}^{n+1}$ with its asymptotic boundary at infinity given by $\partial\Omega$. We note that the equation in (1.1) is a quasilinear non-uniformly elliptic equation. It becomes singular on $\partial\Omega$ since $f = 0$ there. Lin [11] proved that (1.1) admits a unique solution $f \in C(\bar{\Omega}) \bigcap C^\infty(\Omega)$ if $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a C^2-domain with a nonnegative boundary mean curvature $H_{\partial\Omega} \geq 0$ with respect to the inward normal direction of $\partial\Omega$. Concerning the higher global regularity, Lin proved $f \in C^{1/2}(\bar{\Omega})$ if $H_{\partial\Omega} > 0$. In [7], we proved that under the condition $H_{\partial\Omega} \geq 0$, $f \in C^{\frac{1}{n+1}}(\bar{\Omega})$ and

$$[f]_{C^{\frac{1}{n+1}}(\bar{\Omega})} \leq [(n+1)\,\text{diameter}(\Omega)^n]^{\frac{1}{n+1}}.$$

This estimate does not depend on the regularity of the domain, which allows us to discuss (1.1) in domains with singularity. In [7], we also proved that (1.1) admits a unique solution $f \in C^{1/2}(\bar{\Omega}) \bigcap C^\infty(\Omega)$ if Ω is a bounded domain which is the intersection of finitely many bounded convex C^2-domains Ω_i with $H_{\partial\Omega_i} > 0$.

The first author acknowledges the support of NSF Grant DMS-1404596. The second author acknowledges the support of the graduate school of Peking University. The third author acknowledges the support of China Scholarship Council.

Concerning asymptotic behaviors of solutions f of (1.1), we have the following result. Let Ω be a bounded $C^{2,\alpha}$-domain with $H_{\partial\Omega} > 0$, for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Then,

$$\left| \left(\frac{H_{\partial\Omega}}{2d} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} f - 1 \right| \leq C d^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \tag{1.2}$$

where d is the distance function to $\partial\Omega$. We need to mention that the estimate (1.2) is sharp under the present regularity assumption. If $\partial\Omega$ has a higher regularity, we can expand more. For details, refer to [4].

In this paper, we study asymptotic behaviors of solutions f of (1.1) near boundaries with singularity.

There have been only a few results concerning the boundary behaviors of solutions of geometric PDEs in singular domains. This is partly due to the diversity of singularity and complexity of the relevant geometric problems. The first two authors studied the asymptotic behaviors of solutions of the Liouville equation in [5] and solutions of the Loewner-Nirenberg problem in [6] in singular domains and proved that the solutions are well approximated by the corresponding solutions in tangent cones at singular points on the boundary.

Asymptotic behaviors of solutions of (1.1) are more complicated than those of solutions of the Liouville equation and solutions of the Loewner-Nirenberg problem. As the estimate (1.2) illustrates, the positivity of the boundary mean curvature plays an important role in the estimates of solutions near $C^{2,\alpha}$-boundary. When we attempt to generalize (1.2) to domains with singularity, we cannot compare solutions f of (1.1) with the corresponding solutions in tangent cones if the tangent cones have zero mean curvature wherever they are smooth. This is the case if the tangent cones are bounded by finitely many hyperplanes. We need a "model" domain to preserve the positivity of the boundary mean curvature. Such a model domain is provided by the intersection of tangent balls at the singular points.

We prove the following result for $n = 2$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let Ω be a bounded convex domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and, for $0 \in \partial\Omega$ and some $R > 0$, let $\partial\Omega \cap B_R$ consist of two $C^{2,\alpha}$-curves σ_1 and σ_2 intersecting at the origin with an angle $\mu\pi$, for some constants $\alpha, \mu \in (0,1)$, such that σ_i has a positive curvature κ_i at the origin, for $i = 1, 2$. Suppose $f \in C(\bar{\Omega}) \cap C^\infty(\Omega)$ is the solution of (1.1) and h is the corresponding solution in*

$$\Omega_{\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2} = B_{\frac{1}{\kappa_1}}\left(\frac{1}{\kappa_1}\nu_1\right) \bigcap B_{\frac{1}{\kappa_2}}\left(\frac{1}{\kappa_2}\nu_2\right),$$

where ν_i is the unit inner normal vector of σ_i at the origin. Then, there exist a constant r and a $C^{2,\alpha}$-diffeomorphism T: $B_r \to T(B_r) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$, with $T(\Omega \bigcap B_r) = \Omega_{\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2} \bigcap T(B_r)$ and $T(\partial\Omega \bigcap B_r) = \partial\Omega_{\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2} \bigcap T(B_r)$, such that, for any $x \in B_r$,

$$\left| \frac{f(x)}{h(Tx)} - 1 \right| \leq C|x|^\beta, \tag{1.3}$$

where β is a constant in $(0, \alpha/2]$ and C is a positive constant depending only on R, α, μ, and the $C^{2,\alpha}$-norms of σ_1 and σ_2 in B_R.

In the proof of Theorem 1.1, we will construct the map T, which is determined by the distances to σ_i. We note that (1.3) generalizes (1.2) to singular boundaries. We point out that if α is sufficiently small, we can take $\beta = \alpha/2$, which is optimal.

We now describe briefly the proof of Theorem 1.1 is based on a combination of isometric transforms and the maximum principle. Usually, when we discuss asymptotic behaviors of solutions f in the domain Ω with a singularity at x_0, we compare such solutions with the corresponding solutions in tangent cones at x_0. However, the positivity of curvatures is not preserved for tangent cones. Instead, we use the solution $f_{\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2}$ in $\Omega_{\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2}$ defined as intersections of tangent balls as stated in Theorem 1.1. Our goal is to compare the solution f in Ω near x_0 with the solution $f_{\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2}$ in $\Omega_{\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2}$. We note that a given point x in Ω may not necessarily be a point in $\Omega_{\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2}$. So as a part of the comparison of f with $u_{V_{x_0}}$, we need to construct a map T, which maps Ω near x_0 onto $f_{\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2}$ near x_0, and to compare $f(x)$ with $f_{\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2}(Tx)$. We achieve this in two steps.

In the first step, we construct two sets $\widetilde{B}$ and $\widehat{B}$ with the property $\widetilde{B} \subseteq \Omega \subseteq \widehat{B}$ near x. To construct such sets $\widetilde{B}$ and $\widehat{B}$, we first place two balls tangent to σ_i at p_i, the closest point to x on σ_i, for each $i = 1, 2$. We can form $\widetilde{B}$ from the smaller balls and $\widehat{B}$ from the larger balls.

In the second step, we compare the solution f in Ω near x_0 with the solution $f_{\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2}$ in $\Omega_{\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2}$. To this end, we first compare f with the solutions $\widetilde{f}$ and $\widehat{f}$ in $\widetilde{B}$ and $\widehat{B}$, respectively, and then compare $\widetilde{f}$ and $\widehat{f}$ with $f_{\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2}$. We note that the sets $\widetilde{B}$, $\widehat{B}$, and $\Omega_{\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2}$ have the same structure; namely, they are the intersections of two balls. Comparisons of solutions in these sets are aided by isometric transforms in the hyperbolic space.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we prove the existence of solutions of (1.1) in infinite cones and prove some basic estimates for these solutions. In Section 3, we prove that asymptotic expansions near singular boundary points up to certain orders are local properties. In Section 4, we study the asymptotic expansions near singular points with positive curvatures and prove Theorem 1.1.

2. Solutions in Cones

In this section, we discuss (1.1) in infinite cones and prove the existence and uniqueness of its solutions. We also derive some basic estimates. Throughout this section, we assume $n = 2$.

For some constant $\mu < 1$, define

$$V_\mu = \{(r, \theta) \mid r \in (0, \infty), \theta \in (0, \mu\pi)\}. \tag{2.1}$$

This is an infinite cone in $\mathbb{R}^2$, expressed in polar coordinates. Our goal is to find a solution f of (1.1) in the form

$$f = rh(\theta) \quad \text{in } \Omega = V_\mu.$$

By a straightforward calculation, (1.1) has the form

$$\frac{h''+h}{r}-\frac{h'^2(h''+h)}{r(1+h^2+h'^2)}+\frac{2}{rh}=0. \tag{2.2}$$

In view of (2.2), we set

$$Lh=(h''+h)(1+h^2)h+2(1+h^2+h'^2). \tag{2.3}$$

We note that L is an operator acting on functions $h=h(\theta)$ on $(0,\mu\pi)$.

First, we construct supersolutions of L.

Lemma 2.1. *For some constant $\mu\in(0,1)$, there exist constants $A>0$, $B\geq 0$, $\alpha\geq 2$ and $\beta\in(0,1)$ such that*

$$L\left(A(\sin\frac{\theta}{\mu})^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}+B(\sin\frac{\theta}{\mu})^{\frac{1}{1+\beta}}\right)\leq 0 \quad \text{on } (0,\mu\pi). \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. For some $\alpha>0$, set

$$\varphi(\theta)=\left(\sin\frac{\theta}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}. \tag{2.5}$$

Then,

$$\varphi^{1+\alpha}=\sin\frac{\theta}{\mu}.$$

A straightforward differentiation yields

$$\varphi'=\frac{\varphi^{-\alpha}}{1+\alpha}\frac{1}{\mu}\cos\frac{\theta}{\mu}$$

and

$$\varphi''=-\frac{\varphi^{-\alpha}}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)}\sin\frac{\theta}{\mu}-\frac{\alpha\varphi^{-\alpha-1}}{\mu(1+\alpha)}\varphi'\cos\frac{\theta}{\mu}.$$

By a simple substitution, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi''&=-\frac{\varphi^{-\alpha}}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)}\varphi^{1+\alpha}-\frac{\alpha\varphi^{-2\alpha-1}}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)^2}(1-\varphi^{2\alpha+2})\\&=-\frac{1}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)^2}\varphi-\frac{\alpha}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)^2}\varphi^{-1-2\alpha}.\end{aligned}$$

Then, for some positive constant A,

$$\begin{aligned}L(A\varphi)=A^2\varphi(1+A^2\varphi^2)&\left[(1-\frac{1}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)^2})\varphi-\frac{2}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)^2}\varphi^{-2\alpha-1}\right]\\&+2\left[1+A^2\varphi^2+\frac{A^2}{\mu^2(1+\alpha^2)}\varphi^{-2\alpha}(1-\varphi^{2+2\alpha})\right].\end{aligned}$$

We first consider the case $\mu \le 1/3$. With $\alpha = 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} L(A\varphi) &= A^2\varphi(1+A^2\varphi^2)\left[(1-\frac{1}{9\mu^2})\varphi - \frac{2}{9\mu^2}\varphi^{-5}\right] + 2\left[1 + A^2\varphi^2 + A^2\frac{\varphi^{-4}}{9\mu^2}(1-\varphi^6)\right] \\ &= A^2(3-\frac{3}{9\mu^2})\varphi^2 + 2 + A^4\varphi^2\left[(1-\frac{1}{9\mu^2})\varphi^2 - \frac{2}{9\mu^2}\varphi^{-4}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$L(\sqrt{3\mu}\varphi) \le 2 - 2\varphi^{-2} \le 0.$$

Next, we consider the case $\mu > 1/3$. For some positive α and β, set φ as in (2.5) and

$$\psi(\theta) = \left(\sin\frac{\theta}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{1+\beta}}.$$

Then,

$$\psi = \varphi^{\frac{1+\alpha}{1+\beta}} \le \varphi.$$

For some positive constants A and B, set

$$h = A\varphi + B\psi.$$

Now, we write

$$Lh = I + II, \tag{2.6}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I = {} & [1 + A^2\varphi^2 + B^2\psi^2 + 2AB\varphi\psi][A\varphi + B\psi] \\ & \cdot \left\{ A\left[(1-\frac{1}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)^2})\varphi - \frac{\alpha}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)^2}\varphi^{-1-2\alpha}\right] \right. \\ & \left. + B\left[(1-\frac{1}{\mu^2(1+\beta)^2})\psi - \frac{\beta}{\mu^2(1+\beta)^2}\psi^{-1-2\beta}\right] \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} II = 2\Big[& 1 + A^2\varphi^2 + B^2\psi^2 + 2AB\varphi\psi \\ & + A^2\frac{\varphi^{-2\alpha}}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)^2}(1-\varphi^{2+2\alpha}) + B^2\frac{\psi^{-2\beta}}{\mu^2(1+\beta)^2}(1-\psi^{2+2\beta}) \\ & + 2AB\frac{\varphi^{-\alpha}}{\mu(1+\alpha)}\frac{\psi^{-\beta}}{\mu(1+\beta)}\sqrt{(1-\varphi^{2+2\alpha})(1-\psi^{2+2\beta})}\Big]. \end{aligned}$$

Fix an $\alpha \in (2, +\infty)$ and take

$$\beta = \min\left\{\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{\mu} - 1\right), \frac{1}{100}\right\}.$$

With $\psi \le 1$, it is easy to check

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{\mu^2(1+\beta)^2}\right)\psi - \frac{\beta}{\mu^2(1+\beta)^2}\psi^{-1-2\beta} < 0. \tag{2.7}$$

In fact, we only need to require $\beta < 1/\mu - 1$. Next, if $\sin\frac{\theta}{\mu} \le \frac{1}{1+\alpha}$, i.e.,

$$\varphi \le \left(\frac{1}{1+\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}},$$

we have

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)^2}\right)\varphi - \frac{\alpha}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)^2}\varphi^{-1-2\alpha} < 0. \tag{2.8}$$

For $\sin\frac{\theta}{\mu} \in [\frac{1}{1+\alpha}, 1]$, we have $\psi \ge (\frac{1}{1+\alpha})^{\frac{1}{1+\beta}}$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(1 - \frac{1}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)^2}\right)\varphi - \frac{\alpha}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)^2}\varphi^{-1-2\alpha} \\
&\qquad + C\left[\left(1 - \frac{1}{\mu^2(1+\beta)^2}\right)\psi - \frac{\beta}{\mu^2(1+\beta)^2}\psi^{-1-2\beta}\right] \\
&\le 1 - C\left(\frac{1}{\mu^2(1+\beta)^2} - 1\right)\psi \le -1,
\end{aligned}$$

by choosing $C > 0$ large. By combining with (2.7) and (2.8), we have, on $[0, \mu\pi]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(1 - \frac{1}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)^2}\right)\varphi - \frac{\alpha}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)^2}\varphi^{-1-2\alpha} \\
&\qquad + C\left[\left(1 - \frac{1}{\mu^2(1+\beta)^2}\right)\psi - \frac{\beta}{\mu^2(1+\beta)^2}\psi^{-1-2\beta}\right] \le -\eta,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

for some positive constant η. With A to be determined, we set

$$B = CA.$$

With such a choice of B, we proceed to prove $Lh \le 0$ for suitably chosen A.

We first consider $\sin\frac{\theta}{\mu} < \frac{1}{1+\alpha}$. By (2.7) and (2.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I &\le 1 \cdot (A\varphi) \cdot A\left[\left(1 - \frac{1}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)^2}\right)\varphi - \frac{\alpha}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)^2}\varphi^{-1-2\alpha}\right] \\
&\le -\frac{A^2\alpha}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)^2}\varphi^{-2\alpha} + C_1A^2\varphi^{-2\alpha+\tau},
\end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant τ. We note that the omitted terms in I are all nonpositive. Similarly, we have

$$II \le \frac{2A^2}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)^2}\varphi^{-2\alpha} + 2 + C_2A^2\varphi^{-2\alpha+\tau}.$$

Hence, by (2.6),

$$Lh \le A^2\frac{2-\alpha}{\mu^2(1+\alpha)^2}\varphi^{-2\alpha} + 2 + C_0A^2\varphi^{-2\alpha+\tau}.$$

In the following, we always choose $A \ge 1$. There exists a small δ, independent of A, such that

$$Lh < 0 \quad \text{if } \sin\frac{\theta}{\mu} \le \delta.$$

For $\sin\frac{\theta}{\mu} > \delta$, we have, by (2.9),

$$I \le -(A^2\varphi^2)\cdot(A\varphi)\cdot A\eta = -A^4\varphi^3\eta \le -A^4\eta\delta^{\frac{3}{1+\alpha}}.$$

On the other hand,

$$II \le C_* A^2.$$

Hence, by choosing A sufficiently large, depending on δ, we have

$$Lh = I + II < 0 \quad \text{if } \sin\frac{\theta}{\mu} \ge \delta.$$

We have the desired result. □

Remark 2.2. The supersolution h in Lemma 2.1 satisfies

$$h \le C_{\alpha,\mu}(\sin\frac{\theta}{\mu})^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}.$$

In particular, for $\mu \le 1/3$, we can take $\alpha = 2$ and $C_{2,\mu} \to 0$ as $\mu \to 0$.

Next, we introduce an important transform. For any $L > 0$, we define the operator T_L by

$$T_L(x_1,x_2,x_3) = \frac{L}{(x_1-L)^2+x_2^2+x_3^2}(L^2-x_1^2-x_2^2-x_3^2, 2Lx_2, 2Lx_3). \tag{2.10}$$

Then, T_L is an isometric automorphism on $\mathbb{H}^3$ and, restricted on $\mathbb{R}^2\times\{x_3=0\}$, T_L is a conformal transform, which maps the point $(L,0,0)$ to infinity. In fact, $T_L(x_1,x_2,x_3)$ is a composition of the following transformations.

First, consider

$$G_1 : (x_1,x_2,x_3) \mapsto (x_1,x_2,x_3+L).$$

Then, G_1 maps $\{(x_1,x_2,x_3)|\, x_3>0\}$ to $\{(x_1,x_2,x_3)|\, x_3>L\}$. Second, consider

$$G_2 : (x_1,x_2,x_3) \mapsto \frac{2L^2}{(x_1^2+x_2^2+x_3^2)}(x_1,x_2,x_3).$$

Then, G_2 maps $\{(x_1,x_2,x_3)|\, x_3>L\}$ to $\{(x_1,x_2,x_3)|\, x_1^2+x_2^2+(x_3-L)^2<L^2\}$ and maps $\{(x_1,x_2,x_3)|\, x_1^2+x_2^2+(x_3-L)^2<L^2\}$ to $\{(x_1,x_2,x_3)|\, x_3>L\}$. Next, consider

$$G_3 : (x_1,x_2,x_3) \mapsto (x_1,x_2,x_3-L).$$

Then, G_3 maps $\{(x_1,x_2,x_3)|\, x_3>L\}$ to $\{(x_1,x_2,x_3)|\, x_3>0\}$. Last, consider

$$G_4 : (x_1,x_2,x_3) \mapsto (x_3,x_2,-x_1).$$

Then, G_4 is an orthogonal transform which rotates the x_1x_3-plane by $\pi/2$ clockwisely. Then,

$$T_L = G_3G_2G_1G_4G_3G_2G_1.$$

It is easy to see

$$\frac{2L^2x_3}{(x_1-L)^2+x_2^2+x_3^2} \to 0 \quad \text{as } x_1^2+x_2^2+x_3^2 \to \infty.$$

Now we proceed to prove the existence and uniqueness of solutions of (1.1) in cones.

Theorem 2.3. *Let V_μ the the cone as in (2.1), for some $\mu \in (0,1)$. Then, there exists a unique solution f of (1.1) for $\Omega = V_\mu$. Moreover, f has the form $rh(\theta)$.*

Proof. We first prove the existence. For any $R > 0$, set

$$V_{\mu,R} = \{(r,\theta)|\, r \in (0,R), \theta \in (0,\mu\pi)\}.$$

By Theorem 3.1 [7], there exists a unique solution $f_{\mu,R}$ of (1.1) for $\Omega = V_{\mu,R}$ and, by the maximum principle and Lemma 2.1,

$$f_{\mu,R} \le C_{\alpha,\mu} r \left(\sin\frac{\theta}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}} \quad \text{in } V_{\mu,R}. \tag{2.11}$$

By the maximum principle again, we have, for any positive R_1 and R_2 with $R_1 < R_2$,

$$f_{\mu,R_1} \le f_{\mu,R_2} \quad \text{in } V_{\mu,R_1}. \tag{2.12}$$

Next, the uniqueness and scaling imply

$$f_{\mu,k}(x) = k f_{\mu,1}\left(\frac{x}{k}\right).$$

For any positive δ sufficiently small, set

$$W_{\mu,\delta} = \{(r,\theta) \in V_\mu | r \ \in (0,\infty), \theta \in (\delta\pi, (\mu-\delta)\pi)\}.$$

Then for any $x \in W_{\mu,\delta}$, we have

$$d \ge (\sin\delta\pi) r.$$

By employing the method in the proof of Theorem 3.2 in [7], we can prove, for any $x \in W_{\mu,\delta}$ and any $k \ge 2[|x|+1]$,

$$|\nabla f_{\mu,k}| \le C(\mu,\delta,x). \tag{2.13}$$

In fact, for any $k \ge 2[|x|+1]$, $B_{d_x/4}(x) \subseteq V_{\mu,k}$. By Step 1 in the proof of Theorem 3.2 in [7], we have

$$\|\nabla f_{\mu,k}\|_{L^p(B_{d_x/4}(x))} \le C(p,\mu,\delta) d^{\frac{n}{p}}. \tag{2.14}$$

Note that $f_{\mu,k} \ge f_{\mu,2[|x|+1]}$ for any $k \ge 2[|x|+1]$, by (2.12). By combining with (2.14) and proceeding as in Step 2 in the proof of Theorem 3.2 in [7], we can get (2.13) by applying the $W^{2,p}$-estimate. Now for any $x \in V_\mu$, there exists a positive small δ such that $x \in W_{\mu,\delta}$. Then for any $y \in B_{d_x/4}(x)$ and large enough positive k, we have

$$|f_{\mu,k}(x) - f_{\mu,k}(y)| \le C(\mu,\delta,x)|x-y|.$$

Therefore, by (2.12) and the interior estimate, for any $x \in V_\mu$, we have that $f_{\mu,R}(x)$ converges to some $f_\mu(x)$ as $R \to \infty$ and $f_\mu \in C^\infty(V_\mu)$ is a solution of

$$\Delta f - \frac{f_i f_j}{1+|\nabla f|^2} f_{ij} + \frac{2}{f} = 0 \quad \text{in } V_\mu. \tag{2.15}$$

By (2.11), f_μ is continuous up to the boundary of V_μ and $f_\mu = 0$ on ∂V_μ. In summary, f_μ is a solution of (1.1) for $\Omega = V_\mu$. Moreover, for any positive integer k, $f_{\mu,kR}(x)$ converges to $f_\mu(x)$ as R goes to infinity. By the property

$$f_{\mu,kR}(x) = k f_{\mu,R}\left(\frac{x}{k}\right),$$

we obtain

$$f_\mu(x) = k f_\mu\left(\frac{x}{k}\right).$$

Therefore, we can write $f_\mu = rh(\theta)$ for some function $h = h(\theta)$ on $(0, \mu\pi)$.

We now prove the uniqueness. For convenience, we rotate $\mathbb{R}^2$ and assume

$$V_\mu = \left\{(r,\theta) |\, r \in (0,\infty), \theta \in \left(-\frac{\mu\pi}{2}, \frac{\mu\pi}{2}\right)\right\}. \tag{2.16}$$

Let f_1 and f_2 be two solutions of (1.1) for $\Omega = V_\mu$. By Remark 2.3 [11], $\{(x, f_1(x))\}$ and $\{(x, f_2(x))\}$ are two absolutely area-minimizing hypersurfaces with the asymptotic boundary ∂V_μ. Let T_1 be the map defined in (2.10) with $L = 1$. Then, $T_1^{-1}|\{x_3 = 0\}$ maps V_μ conformally to

$$\widetilde{\Omega} = B_{\frac{1}{\sin\frac{\mu\pi}{2}}}\left(\left(0, -\cot\frac{\mu\pi}{2}\right)\right) \bigcap B_{\frac{1}{\sin\frac{\mu\pi}{2}}}\left(\left(0, \cot\frac{\mu\pi}{2}\right)\right),$$

and maps the absolutely area-minimizing hypersurface $\{(x, f_i(x))\}$ with the asymptotic boundary ∂V_μ to the absolutely area-minimizing hypersurface $\{(y, \widetilde{f_i}(y))\}$ with the asymptotic boundary $\partial\widetilde{\Omega}$, $i = 1, 2$. By Corollary 2.4 [11], $\widetilde{f_1} = \widetilde{f_2}$. Hence, $f_1 = f_2$. □

Next, we proceed as Lin [11]. Let f be a solution of (1.1) in Ω. Locally near each boundary point, the graph of f can be represented by a function over its vertical tangent plane. Specifically, we fix a boundary point of Ω, say the origin, and assume that the vector $e_n = (0, \cdots, 0, 1)$ is the interior normal vector to $\partial\Omega$ at the origin. Then, with $x = (x', x_n)$, the x'-hyperplane is the tangent plane of $\partial\Omega$ at the origin and the boundary $\partial\Omega$ can be expressed in a neighborhood of the origin as a graph of a smooth function over $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{0\}$, say

$$x_n = \varphi(x').$$

We now denote points in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} = \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ by (x', x_n, t). The vertical hyperplane given by $x_n = 0$ is the tangent plane to the graph of f at the origin in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. We can represent the graph of f as a graph of a new function u defined in terms of $(x', 0, t)$ for small x' and t, with $t > 0$. In other words, we treat $\mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}$ as our new base space and write $u = u(x', t)$. Then, for some $R > 0$, u satisfies

$$\Delta u - \frac{u_i u_j}{1 + |\nabla u|^2} u_{ij} - \frac{n u_t}{t} = 0 \quad \text{in } B_R^+ \tag{2.17}$$

and

$$u(\cdot, 0) = \varphi \quad \text{on } B_R'. \tag{2.18}$$

We note that u and f are related by

$$x_n = u(x', t) \tag{2.19}$$

and

$$t = f(x', x_n). \tag{2.20}$$

Set

$$u_{n+1}(x', t) = \varphi(x') + \sum_{i=2}^{n+1} c_i(x')t^i + c_{n+1,1}(x')t^{n+1}\log t. \tag{2.21}$$

We have the following result.

Lemma 2.4. *For some constant $\alpha \in (0,1)$, let $\varphi \in C^{n+1,\alpha}(B'_R)$ be a given function and $u \in C(\bar{B}^+_R) \cap C^\infty(B^+_R)$ be a solution of (2.17)-(2.18). Then, there exist functions $c_i \in C^{n+1-i,\epsilon}(B'_R)$, for $i = 0, 2, 4, \cdots, n+1$, $c_{n+1,1} \in C^\epsilon(B'_R)$, and any $\epsilon \in (0,\alpha)$, such that, for u_{n+1} defined as in (2.21), for any $m = 0, 1, \cdots, n+1$, any $\epsilon \in (0,\alpha)$, and any $r \in (0, R)$,*

$$\partial_t^m(u - u_{n+1}) \in C^\epsilon(\bar{B}^+_r),$$

and, for any $(x', t) \in B^+_{R/2}$,

$$|\partial_t^m(u - u_{n+1})(x', t)| \le Ct^{n+1-m+\alpha},$$

for some positive constant C depending only on n, α, R, the L^∞-norm of u in B^+_R, and the $C^{n+1,\alpha}$-norm of φ in B'_R.

Lemma 2.4 follows from Theorem 1.1 [4] by taking $\ell = k = n+1$. In fact, $c_2, \cdots, c_n$ and $c_{n+1,1}$ are coefficients for local terms and have explicit expressions in terms of φ. Meanwhile, c_{n+1} is the coefficient of the first nonlocal term.

Corollary 2.5. *Let V_μ be the cone as in (2.1), for some $\mu \in (0,1)$, and let $f = rh(\theta)$ be the solution of (1.1) for $\Omega = V_\mu$ as in Theorem 2.3. Then,*

$$\lim_{\theta\to 0} \theta^{-1/3}h(\theta) > 0,$$

and

$$\lim_{\theta\to 0} \theta^{2/3}h'(\theta) > 0.$$

Proof. Take $n = 2$ and consider (2.21) at $(r, \theta) = (1, 0) \in \partial V_\mu$. Then, $c_2 = 0$, $c_{3,1} = 0$, and, by renaming the coefficient for t^3,

$$u = a_\mu t^3 + O(t^4), \tag{2.22}$$

where a_μ is a constant and

$$\begin{aligned} u &= \tan\theta, \\ t = f &= \frac{1}{\cos\theta}h(\theta). \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

We write the coefficient of t^3 as a_μ to emphasize its dependence on μ.

Fix an arbitrary $\alpha \in (2, \infty)$. By Lemma 2.1, we have

$$f \leq C_{\alpha,\mu} r \left(\sin \frac{\theta}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}} \quad \text{in } V_\mu.$$

Therefore, if $t > 0$ is small, we have

$$u \geq \widetilde{C}_\alpha t^{1+\alpha},$$

for some positive constant $\widetilde{C}_\alpha$. With (2.22), this implies $a_\mu > 0$ and $u \sim t^3$. Therefore, for $\theta > 0$ small, we have

$$f \leq Cr \left(\sin \frac{\theta}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}},$$

and

$$h(\theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt[3]{a_\mu}} \theta^{\frac{1}{3}} + O(\theta^{\frac{2}{3}}). \tag{2.24}$$

Next, we note

$$u_t = 3a_\mu t^2 + O(t^3).$$

By (2.23) and $u_\theta = u_t t_\theta$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\cos^2 \theta} = u_t \left(\frac{\sin \theta h(\theta)}{\cos^2 \theta} + \frac{h'(\theta)}{\cos \theta}\right).$$

With (2.24), we have

$$h'(\theta) = \frac{1}{3\sqrt[3]{a_\mu}} \theta^{-\frac{2}{3}} + O(\theta^{-\frac{1}{3}}). \tag{2.25}$$

We have the desired results. □

In Theorem 2.3, we proved the existence of solutions of (2.2) in V_μ and obtained the unique solutions of the form $f = rh_\mu(\theta)$. Here, $h_\mu(\theta)$ is a function of θ on $(0, \mu\pi)$ and we adopt the subscript μ to indicate that h_μ.

We now compare h_μ for different μ.

Lemma 2.6. *Let μ_1 and μ_2 be two distinct constants in $(0, 1)$ and $h_{\mu_i}(\theta)$ be the solution of (2.2) on $(0, \mu_i\pi)$, for $i = 1, 2$. Then, for $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_1 + \delta(\mu_1)$,*

$$h_{\mu_1}(\mu_1\theta) \leq h_{\mu_2}(\mu_2\theta) \leq C_{\mu_1,\mu_2} h_{\mu_1}(\mu_1\theta) \quad \text{for any } \theta \in (0, \pi), \tag{2.26}$$

where $\delta(\mu_1)$ and C_{μ_1,μ_2} are positive constants given by

$$\delta(\mu_1) = \left(\left(\frac{1}{8b_{\mu_1}} + 1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1\right)\mu_1,$$

and

$$C_{\mu_1,\mu_2} = \left(1 + \frac{b_{\mu_1}}{\mu_1^2}(\mu_2^2 - \mu_1^2)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{2.27}$$

with

$$b_{\mu_1} = \max\left\{ \frac{81}{128} \sup_{\theta\in(0,\mu_1\pi)} g_{\mu_1}^4, \sup_{\theta\in(0,\mu_1\pi)} \left[\frac{3(g_{\mu_1})^2+2}{-((g_{\mu_1})''(g_{\mu_1})^3+(g_{\mu_1})^4)} \right] \right\}. \tag{2.28}$$

Proof. By (2.2), we have

$$h''_{\mu_i} h_{\mu_i} + h''_{\mu_i} h^3_{\mu_i} + 3h^2_{\mu_i} + h^4_{\mu_i} + 2 + 2h'^2_{\mu_i} = 0 \quad \text{on } (0,\mu_i\pi). \tag{2.29}$$

For convenience, we set

$$\widetilde{h}_{\mu_i}(\theta) = h_{\mu_i}(\mu_i\theta) \quad \text{for } \theta\in(0,\pi).$$

Note

$$\widetilde{h}'_{\mu_i}(\theta) = \mu_i h'_{\mu_i}(\mu_i\theta), \quad \widetilde{h}''_{\mu_i}(\theta) = \mu_i^2 h''_{\mu_i}(\mu_i\theta) \quad \text{for } \theta\in(0,\pi).$$

Then, (2.29) implies

$$\frac{1}{\mu_i^2}\widetilde{h}''_{\mu_i}\widetilde{h}_{\mu_i} + \frac{1}{\mu_i^2}\widetilde{h}''_{\mu_i}\widetilde{h}^3_{\mu_i} + 3\widetilde{h}^2_{\mu_i} + \widetilde{h}^4_{\mu_i} + 2 + \frac{2}{\mu_i^2}\widetilde{h}'^2_{\mu_i} = 0 \quad \text{on } (0,\pi).$$

In view of this equation, we set

$$\mathfrak{L}_{\mu_2} h = \frac{1}{\mu_2^2} h''h + \frac{1}{\mu_2^2} h''h^3 + 3h^2 + h^4 + 2 + \frac{2}{\mu_2^2} h'^2.$$

We now prove the second inequality in (2.26). We claim, for the positive constant C as in (2.27),

$$\mathfrak{L}_{\mu_2}(C\widetilde{h}_{\mu_1}) \le 0 \quad \text{on } (0,\pi). \tag{2.30}$$

Assuming (2.30), we proceed as follows. Set Q by

$$Q(h) = \Delta h - \frac{h_i h_j h_{ij}}{1+|\nabla h|^2} + \frac{2}{h}.$$

Comparing Q and $\mathfrak{L}_{\mu_2}$, we note that (2.30) implies

$$Q\left(Crh_{\mu_1}\left(\frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2}\theta\right)\right) \le 0 \quad \text{in } V_{\mu_2}.$$

As shown in the proof of Theorem 2.3, we can take a sequence $f_{\mu_2,k}$ such that

$$Q(f_{\mu_2,k}) = 0 \quad \text{in } V_{\mu_2,k},$$

and

$$f_{\mu_2,k} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial V_{\mu_2,k}.$$

Then, $f_{\mu_2,k} \to f_{\mu_2} = rh_{\mu_2}(\theta)$ as $k\to\infty$ and, by the maximum principle,

$$f_{\mu_2,k} \le Crh_{\mu_1}\left(\frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2}\theta\right) \quad \text{in } V_{\mu_2,k}.$$

Letting $k\to\infty$, we obtain

$$rh_{\mu_2}(\theta) = f_{\mu_2} \le Crh_{\mu_1}\left(\frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2}\theta\right) \quad \text{in } V_{\mu_2}.$$

This is the desired conclusion.

Now, we proceed to prove (2.30). Note

$$\mathfrak{L}_{\mu_2}(C\widetilde{h}_{\mu_1})(\theta) = \Big[C^2\frac{\mu_1^2}{\mu_2^2}h''_{\mu_1}h_{\mu_1} + C^4\frac{\mu_1^2}{\mu_2^2}h''_{\mu_1}hg^3_{\mu_1} + 3C^2h^2_{\mu_1} + C^4h^4_{\mu_1} + 2 + 2C^2\frac{\mu_1^2}{\mu_2^2}h'^2_{\mu_1}\Big](\mu_1\theta).$$

Set

$$a = \frac{\mu_2}{\mu_1}.$$

By (2.29) with $i = 1$, we have

$$\mathfrak{L}_{\mu_2}(C\widetilde{h}_{\mu_1}) = \frac{C^2}{a^2}(-(h''_{\mu_1}h^3_{\mu_1} + h^4_{\mu_1}))\cdot\Big\{-(C^2-1) + \Big[3(a^2-1)h^2_{\mu_1} + C^2(a^2-1)h^4_{\mu_1} + \frac{2}{C^2}(a^2-1) + \frac{2}{C^2} - 2\Big]\frac{1}{-(h''_{\mu_1}h^3_{\mu_1} + h^4_{\mu_1})}\Big\}.$$

By (2.29) again, we have

$$h''_{\mu_1} + h_{\mu_1} < 0.$$

To prove (2.30), it is equivalent to verify

$$C^2 - 1 \geq \Big[3(a^2-1)h^2_{\mu_1} + C^2(a^2-1)h^4_{\mu_1} + \frac{2}{C^2}(a^2-1) + \frac{2}{C^2} - 2\Big]\cdot\frac{1}{-(h''_{\mu_1}h^3_{\mu_1} + h^4_{\mu_1})}, \tag{2.31}$$

with $C = C_{\mu_1,\mu_2}$ as in (2.27). First, (2.27) implies

$$C^2 = 1 + b_{\mu_1}(a^2-1).$$

By $\mu_2 \in (\mu_1, \mu_1 + \delta(\mu_1))$ and the definition of $\delta(\mu_1)$, we have

$$C^4 \leq (\frac{9}{8})^2.$$

Then, using the definition of b_{μ_1} in (2.28), we get

$$C^2(a^2-1)h^4_{\mu_1} \leq C^2(a^2-1)\max(h^4_{\mu_1}) \leq \frac{2b_{\mu_1}(a^2-1)}{C^2} = -(\frac{2}{C^2} - 2).$$

Hence,

$$C^2(a^2-1)h^4_{\mu_1} + (\frac{2}{C^2} - 2) \leq 0.$$

Now we verify

$$C^2 - 1 \geq (3h^2_{\mu_1} + \frac{2}{C^2})(a^2-1)\frac{1}{-(h''_{\mu_1}h^3_{\mu_1} + h^4_{\mu_1})}.$$

Note that $2/C^2 \leq 2$ and $[-(h''_{\mu_1}h^3_{\mu_1} + h^4_{\mu_1})]^{-1}$ is bounded. By the definition of b_{μ_1}, we have

$$C^2 - 1 = b_{\mu_1}(a^2-1) \geq (3h^2_{\mu_1} + \frac{2}{C^2})(a^2-1)\frac{1}{-(h''_{\mu_1}h^3_{\mu_1} + h^4_{\mu_1})}.$$

This ends the proof of (2.30).

Next, we prove the first inequality in (2.26). We aim to verify $\mathfrak{L}_{\mu_2}(\widetilde{h}_{\mu_1}) \geq 0$ and then proceed similarly as in the first part of the present proof. By the earlier calculation and (2.29), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{L}_{\mu_2}(\widetilde{h}_{\mu_1})(\theta) &= \left[\frac{\mu_1^2}{\mu_2^2}h''_{\mu_1}h_{\mu_1} + \frac{\mu_1^2}{\mu_2^2}h''_{\mu_1}h^3_{\mu_1} + 3h^2_{\mu_1} + h^4_{\mu_1} + 2 + 2\frac{\mu_1^2}{\mu_2^2}h'^2_{\mu_1}\right](\mu_1\theta)\\ &= \left[\left(1 - \frac{\mu_1^2}{\mu_2^2}\right)(3h^2_{\mu_1} + h^4_{\mu_1} + 2)\right](\mu_1\theta) \geq 0,\end{aligned}$$

where we used $\mu_1 < \mu_2$ in the last inequality. □

We now compare a_μ in (2.22) for different μ.

Lemma 2.7. *Let μ_1 and μ_2 be two distinct constants in $(0,1)$ and a_{μ_i} be defined as in (2.22) for $\mu = \mu_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Then, for $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_1 + \delta(\mu_1)$,*

$$\frac{\mu_2}{\mu_1}C^{-3}_{\mu_1,\mu_2}a_{\mu_1} \leq a_{\mu_2} \leq \frac{\mu_2}{\mu_1}a_{\mu_1},$$

where $\delta(\mu_1)$ and C_{μ_1,μ_2} are determined in Lemma 2.6.

Proof. By (2.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tan\theta &= a_{\mu_1}\left(\frac{h_{\mu_1}(\theta)}{\cos\theta}\right)^3 + O\bigg(\left(\frac{h_{\mu_1}(\theta)}{\cos\theta}\right)^4\bigg),\\ \tan\theta' &= a_{\mu_2}\left(\frac{h_{\mu_2}(\theta')}{\cos\theta'}\right)^3 + O\bigg(\left(\frac{h_{\mu_2}(\theta')}{\cos\theta'}\right)^4\bigg).\end{aligned}$$

Take $\theta' = \frac{\mu_2}{\mu_1}\theta$. Then,

$$\lim_{\theta\to 0}\frac{a_{\mu_1}h^3_{\mu_1}(\theta)}{a_{\mu_2}h^3_{\mu_2}\left(\frac{\mu_2}{\mu_1}\theta\right)} = \frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2}.$$

By Lemma 2.6, for any $\mu_2 \in (\mu_1, \mu_1 + \delta(\mu_1))$, we have

$$h_{\mu_1}(\theta) \leq h_{\mu_2}\left(\frac{\mu_2}{\mu_1}\theta\right) \leq C_{\mu_1,\mu_2}h_{\mu_1}(\theta).$$

This implies the desired result by letting $\theta \to 0$. □

We conclude this section with a remark on a_μ. We note that a_μ is defined in (2.22). In fact, it can be computed by h_μ directly as follows:

$$\lim_{\theta\to 0}\theta^{-\frac{1}{3}}h_\mu(\theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt[3]{a_\mu}}.$$

This is implied by (2.24).

3. Local Asymptotic Expansions

In this section, we prove that asymptotic expansions near singular boundary points up to certain orders are local properties.

Lemma 3.1. *Let Ω and Ω_* be two convex domains in $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that, for some $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and some $R_0 > 0$,*

$$\Omega \bigcap B_{R_0}(x_0) = \Omega_* \bigcap B_{R_0}(x_0),$$

and that $\partial\Omega \cap B_{R_0}(x_0)$ consists of two $C^{1,1}$-curves σ_1, σ_2 intersecting at x_0 with the angle between the tangent lines of σ_1 and σ_2 given by $\mu\pi$, for some $\mu \in (0,1)$. Suppose that f and f_* are solutions of (1.1) for Ω and Ω_*, respectively. Then, for some $\tau \in (0,1)$,

$$|f(x) - f_*(x)| \le C f(x) \left(\frac{|x - x_0|}{r_0}\right)^{\tau} \quad \text{for any } x \in \Omega \cap B_{r_0}(x_0), \tag{3.1}$$

where r_0 and C are positive constants depending only on R, μ and the $C^{1,1}$-norms of σ_1 and σ_2 in $B_{R_0}(x_0)$.

Proof. Set ν_i to be the unit inner normal vector to σ_i at x_0, for $i = 1, 2$. Note $\Omega \subseteq V_{x_0}$ since Ω is convex. By the maximum principle, we have, for any $x \in \Omega$,

$$f(x) \le f_\mu(x) = |x - x_0| h_\mu(\theta), \tag{3.2}$$

where f_μ is the solution of (1.1) for $\Omega = V_{x_0}$. We consider two cases.

Case 1. We first prove (3.1) in the region $\{d \ge |x - x_0|^{\frac{3}{2}}\}$.

Since both σ_1 and σ_2 are $C^{1,1}$, there exists a positive constant R, depending only on R_0, μ, and the $C^{1,1}$-norms of σ_1 and σ_2 in $B_{R_0}(x_0)$, such that

$$\widetilde{\Omega} \equiv B_R(x_0 + R\nu_1) \bigcap B_R(x_0 + R\nu_2) \subseteq \Omega.$$

Let $\widetilde{f}$ be the solution of (1.1) for $\widetilde{\Omega}$. The maximum principle implies

$$f \ge \widetilde{f} \quad \text{in } \widetilde{\Omega}. \tag{3.3}$$

We note that the tangent cone of Ω at x_0 is also the tangent cone of $\widetilde{\Omega}$ at a_0. It is easy to see that $\partial B_R(x_0 + R\nu_1)$ and $\partial B_R(x_0 + R\nu_2)$ intersect at two points, one of which is x_0 and another denoted by q. A simple calculation yields

$$|x_0 q| = 2R \sin\frac{\mu\pi}{2}.$$

Set $L = R\sin\frac{\mu\pi}{2}$. For convenience, we assume

$$x_0 = (-L, 0), \quad q = (L, 0).$$

We consider the map T_L introduced in (2.10). Then, T_L maps the minimal surface $\{(x, \widetilde{f}(x))\}$ in $\mathbb{H}^3$ to the minimal surface $\{(y, \widetilde{f}_\mu(y))\}$ in $\mathbb{H}^3$ and maps conformally Ω_0 to an infinite cone $\widetilde{V}$, which conjugates V_{x_0}. Note

$$\widetilde{V} = V_{x_0} + \frac{1}{2}\overrightarrow{x_0 q}.$$

By (2.10) and (3.2), we have

$$JT_L|_{(x_0,0)} = \frac{1}{2} I_{3\times 3},$$

and, for $|x - x_0|$ small,

$$y_1 = \frac{1}{2}(x_1 + L) + O(|x - x_0|^2),$$
$$y_2 = \left(\frac{1}{2} + O(|x - x_0|)\right) x_2,$$

and

$$\widetilde{f}_\mu(y) = \left(\frac{1}{2} + O(|x - x_0|)\right) \widetilde{f}(x).$$

Corollary 2.5 implies, for $\theta \in [-\frac{1}{2}\mu\pi + \frac{\delta\pi}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\mu\pi - \frac{\delta\pi}{2}]$,

$$|h'_\mu(\theta)| \le C_* \delta^{-\frac{2}{3}},$$

where C_* is some positive constant depending only on μ. With $\widetilde{f}_\mu(y) = |y| h_\mu(\theta)$, we obtain

$$|\nabla \widetilde{f}_\mu| \le C\delta^{-\frac{2}{3}} \quad \text{for } \theta \in \left[-\frac{1}{2}\mu\pi + \frac{\delta\pi}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\mu\pi - \frac{\delta\pi}{2}\right].$$

If $|x - x_0|$ is small and $d \ge |x - x_0|^{\frac{3}{2}}$, then the angle δ between $\overline{xx_0}$ and l_i is greater than $|x - x_0|^{\frac{1}{2}}/2$, for $i = 1, 2$, where l_i is the tangent line of σ_i at x_0. By (2.24) and (2.25), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{f}_\mu(y) &= \widetilde{f}_\mu\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_1 + L), \frac{1}{2}x_2\right) + \delta^{-\frac{2}{3}} O(|x - x_0|^2) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{f}_\mu(x_1 + L, x_2) + O(|x - x_0|^{\frac{5}{3}}) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}|x - x_0| h_\mu(\theta)(1 + O(|x - x_0|^{\frac{1}{2}})).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, in the region $\{d \ge |x - x_0|^{\frac{3}{2}}\}$, we have

$$\widetilde{f}(x) = |x - x_0| h_\mu(\theta)(1 + O(|x - x_0|^{\frac{1}{2}})).$$

By combining with (3.3), we get, for any x with small $|x - x_0|$ and $d \ge |x - x_0|^{\frac{3}{2}}$,

$$f(x) \ge |x - x_0| h_\mu(\theta)(1 + O(|x - x_0|^{\frac{1}{2}})). \tag{3.4}$$

By (3.2) and (3.4), we obtain, for such x,

$$|x - x_0| h_\mu(\theta)(1 + O(|x - x_0|^{\frac{1}{2}})) \le f(x) \le |x - x_0| h_\mu(\theta). \tag{3.5}$$

Similar estimates also hold for f_*. Hence, for such x,

$$|f(x) - f_*(x)| \le C_0 f(x) |x - x_0|^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{3.6}$$

Case 2. Next, we prove (3.1) in the region $\{d \le |x-x_0|^{\frac{3}{2}}\}$. In the following, we assume $x_0 = 0$. We will prove there exist a constant C sufficiently large and two constants α, r_0 sufficiently small such that

$$f_* \ge f(1 + f^\alpha - C|x|^\alpha) \tag{3.7}$$

in

$$\Omega_0 \equiv \{d \le |x|^{\frac{3}{2}}\} \bigcap \{1 + f^\alpha - C|x|^\alpha \ge 0\} \bigcap B_{r_0} \bigcap \Omega. \tag{3.8}$$

Let

$$C = \frac{1}{r_0^\alpha} + 1, \quad \alpha = \frac{1}{100}. \tag{3.9}$$

We can take r_0 small enough such that

$$\frac{1}{r_0^\alpha} \ge 2C_0,$$

where C_0 is the constant as in (3.6). We set

$$\widetilde{Q}(w) = w(1 + |\nabla w|^2)\left(\Delta w - \frac{w_i w_j w_{ij}}{1 + |\nabla w|^2} + \frac{n}{w}\right),$$

or

$$\widetilde{Q}(w) = w\Delta w + w(|\nabla w|^2 \Delta w - w_i w_j w_{ij}) + n + n|\nabla w|^2.$$

We claim

$$\widetilde{Q}(f(1 + f^\alpha - C|x|^\alpha)) \ge 0 = \widetilde{Q}(f_*) \quad \text{in } \Omega_0 \tag{3.10}$$

and

$$f_* \ge f(1 + f^\alpha - C|x|^\alpha) \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_0. \tag{3.11}$$

Then, the maximum principle implies (3.7).

We first prove (3.11). Since Ω is convex, Ω is in the tangent cone of Ω at 0. By (3.2), we have

$$f \le C_\mu |x| \left(\sin\frac{\theta}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

A simple geometric argument yields

$$f \le C_\mu |x| \cdot \left(\frac{d + C|x|^2}{|x|}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}},$$

and hence,

$$\frac{f}{|x|} \le C_\mu |x|^{\frac{1}{6}} \quad \text{in } \Omega_0. \tag{3.12}$$

Note that, for r_0 small,

$$f^\alpha \le \frac{|x|^\alpha}{100}. \tag{3.13}$$

Therefore, by (3.6) and (3.13), we have (3.11). We note that we need to discuss $|x| = r_0$ and $d = |x|^{\frac{3}{2}}$ separately.

Now we proceed to prove (3.10). We will do this for general n under the conditions (3.12) and (3.13). Set

$$\begin{aligned} h_0 &= 1 + f^\alpha - C|x|^\alpha, \\ h &= 1 + (1+\alpha)f^\alpha - C|x|^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$g = fh_0.$$

Then,

$$g_i = f_i h - C\alpha|x|^{\alpha-2} f x_i,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} g_{ij} = f_{ij}h + \alpha(1+\alpha)f^{\alpha-1}f_i f_j - C\alpha|x|^{\alpha-2}(f_i x_j + f_j x_i) \\ - C\alpha(\alpha-2)|x|^{\alpha-4} f x_i x_j - C\alpha|x|^{\alpha-2} f\delta_{ij}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$|\nabla g|^2 = |\nabla f|^2 h^2 - 2C\alpha|x|^{\alpha-2} f h(x\cdot\nabla f) + C^2\alpha^2|x|^{2\alpha-2} f^2,$$

and

$$\Delta g = \Delta f h + \alpha(1+\alpha)f^{\alpha-1}|\nabla f|^2 - 2C\alpha|x|^{\alpha-2}(x\cdot\nabla f) - C\alpha(\alpha-2+n)|x|^{\alpha-2} f.$$

Next, a straightforward calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla g|^2\Delta g - g_i g_j g_{ij} = (|\nabla f|^2\Delta f - f_i f_j f_{ij})h^3 \\ - 2C\alpha|x|^{\alpha-2} f h^2[(x\cdot\nabla f)\Delta f - x_i f_j f_{ij}] \\ + C^2\alpha^2|x|^{2\alpha-4} f^2 h[|x|^2\Delta f - x_i x_j f_{ij}] \\ + C\alpha(2-\alpha)|x|^{\alpha-4} f h^2[|x|^2|\nabla f|^2 - (x\cdot\nabla f)^2] \\ + C^2\alpha^3(1+\alpha)|x|^{2\alpha-4} f^{\alpha+1}[|x|^2|\nabla f|^2 - (x\cdot\nabla f)^2] \\ - 2C^2\alpha^2|x|^{2\alpha-4} f h[|x|^2|\nabla f|^2 - (x\cdot\nabla f)^2] \\ - C\alpha(n-1)|x|^{\alpha-2} f h^2|\nabla f|^2 \\ + 2C^2\alpha^2(n-1)|x|^{2\alpha-4} f^2 h(x\cdot\nabla f) - C^3\alpha^3(n-1)|x|^{3\alpha-4} f^3. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we can write $\widetilde{Q}(g)$ as

$$\widetilde{Q}(g) = I + II + III,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= f\Delta f h_0 h + f(|\nabla f|^2\Delta f - f_i f_j f_{ij})h^3 h_0 + n + n|\nabla f|^2 h^2,\\
II &= -2C\alpha|x|^{\alpha-2}f^2h^2h_0[(x\cdot\nabla f)\Delta f - x_i f_j f_{ij}]\\
&\quad + C^2\alpha^2|x|^{2\alpha-4}f^3hh_0[|x|^2\Delta f - x_i x_j f_{ij}]\\
&\quad + 2C^2\alpha^2|x|^{2\alpha-4}f^2hh_0[(x\cdot\nabla f)^2 - |x|^2|\nabla f|^2]\\
&\quad - C\alpha(n-1)|x|^{\alpha-2}f^2h^2h_0|\nabla f|^2\\
&\quad + 2C^2\alpha^2(n-1)|x|^{2\alpha-4}f^3hh_0(x\cdot\nabla f)\\
&\quad - 2C\alpha|x|^{\alpha-2}fh_0(x\cdot\nabla f) - 2nC\alpha|x|^{\alpha-2}fh(x\cdot\nabla f)\\
&\quad - C^3\alpha^3(n-1)|x|^{3\alpha-4}f^4h_0 - C\alpha(\alpha-2+n)|x|^{\alpha-2}f^2h_0,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
III &= C\alpha(2-\alpha)|x|^{\alpha-4}f^2h^2h_0[|x|^2|\nabla f|^2 - (x\cdot\nabla f)^2]\\
&\quad + C^2\alpha^3(1+\alpha)|x|^{2\alpha-4}f^{\alpha+2}h_0[|x|^2|\nabla f|^2 - (x\cdot\nabla f)^2]\\
&\quad + \alpha(1+\alpha)f^\alpha h_0|\nabla f|^2 + nC^2\alpha^2|x|^{2\alpha-2}f^2.
\end{aligned}$$

First, we note that $III \geq 0$. Next by $\widetilde{Q}(f) = 0$, we have,

$$f\Delta f + f(|\nabla f|^2\Delta f - f_i f_j f_{ij}) + n + n|\nabla f|^2 = 0. \tag{3.14}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= f\Delta f h_0 h + f(|\nabla f|^2\Delta f - f_i f_j f_{ij})h^3h_0 + n + n|\nabla f|^2h^2\\
&= -(hh_0 - h^3h_0)f(|\nabla f|^2\Delta f - f_i f_j f_{ij}) + n(h^2 - hh_0)|\nabla f|^2 + n(1-hh_0)\\
&= -hh_0(1-h^2)f(|\nabla f|^2\Delta f - f_i f_j f_{ij}) + n\alpha f^\alpha h|\nabla f|^2 + n(1-hh_0).
\end{aligned}$$

By (3.13), we have

$$0 \leq h_0 < h \leq 1 \quad \text{in } \Omega_0,$$

and

$$1 - h^2 \geq \frac{99}{100}C|x|^\alpha, \quad 1 - hh_0 \geq \frac{99}{100}C|x|^\alpha \quad \text{in } \Omega_0.$$

We note that $\widetilde{Q}(w)$ is invariant under orthogonal transforms. Fix a point $p \in \Omega_0$ and assume, by a rotation, that $f_{ij}(p) = 0$ for $i \neq j$. In the following, we calculate $\widetilde{Q}(g)$ at p. First,

$$I = -hh_0(1-h^2)f\sum_{i=1}^n(|\nabla f|^2 - f_i^2)f_{ii} + n\alpha f^\alpha h|\nabla f|^2 + n(1-hh_0).$$

Since f is concave by Theorem 3.1 [7], then $f_{ii} \leq 0$ and hence

$$I \geq \frac{99}{100}C|x|^\alpha hh_0 f\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{k\neq i}f_k^2|f_{ii}| + n\alpha f^\alpha h|\nabla f|^2 + \frac{99}{100}nC|x|^\alpha. \tag{3.15}$$

We now consider terms in II. For illustrations, we consider the following three terms:

$$\begin{aligned} II_1 &= -2C\alpha|x|^{\alpha-2}f^2h^2h_0[(x\cdot\nabla f)\Delta f - x_if_jf_{ij}],\\ II_2 &= -C\alpha(n-1)|x|^{\alpha-2}f^2h^2h_0|\nabla f|^2,\\ II_3 &= -C^3\alpha^3(n-1)|x|^{3\alpha-4}f^4h_0. \end{aligned}$$

For II_1, we write

$$II_1 = -2C\alpha\left(\frac{f}{|x|}\right)^{1-\alpha} f^{1+\alpha}h^2h_0\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{k\neq i}\frac{x_k}{|x|}f_kf_{ii}.$$

By (3.12), we have

$$C\left(\frac{f}{|x|}\right)^{1-\alpha} \le \left(\frac{1}{r_0^\alpha}+1\right)(C_\mu|x|^{\frac{1}{6}})^{1-\alpha} \le \frac{1}{100}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |II_1| &\le \frac{\alpha}{100}f^{1+\alpha}h^2h_0\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{k\neq i}f_k^2|f_{ii}| + \frac{\alpha}{100}f^\alpha h^2h_0 f\sum_{i=1}^n|f_{ii}|\\ &\le \frac{\alpha}{100}f^\alpha h^2h_0 f\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{k\neq i}f_k^2|f_{ii}| + \frac{n\alpha}{100}f^\alpha h(1+|\nabla f|^2), \end{aligned}$$

where we used (3.14) with $f_{ii}\le 0$. For II_2, we write

$$II_2 = -C\alpha(n-1)\left(\frac{f}{|x|}\right)^{2-\alpha} f^\alpha h^2h_0|\nabla f|^2.$$

Then,

$$|II_2| \le (n-1)\alpha\left(\frac{1}{r_0^\alpha}+1\right)(C_\mu r_0)^{2-\alpha}f^\alpha h^2h_0|\nabla f|^2 \le \frac{\alpha}{100}f^\alpha h|\nabla f|^2.$$

For II_3, we write

$$II_3 = -C^3\alpha^3(n-1)\left(\frac{f}{|x|}\right)^{4-3\alpha} f^{3\alpha}h_0.$$

Then,

$$|II_3| \le \left(\frac{1}{r_0^\alpha}+1\right)^3\alpha^3(n-1)(C_\mu|x|^{\frac{1}{6}})^{4-3\alpha}f^\alpha h_0 \le \frac{\alpha}{100}f^\alpha h.$$

We can consider other terms in II similarly. Therefore, with (3.15), we obtain $\widetilde{Q}(g)\ge 0$ at $p\in\Omega_0$. Since p is arbitrary, we have (3.10). □

4. Singular Points with Positive Curvatures

Let Ω be a bounded convex domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and, for some $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $R > 0$, let $\partial\Omega \cap B_R(x_0)$ consist of two $C^{2,\alpha}$-curves σ_1 and σ_2 intersecting at the origin at an angle $\mu\pi$, for some constants $\alpha, \mu \in (0,1)$. Assume the curvature κ_i of σ_i at x_0 is positive and denote by $R_i = 1/\kappa_i$. Set

$$\Omega_{x_0,\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2} = B_{R_1}(x_0 + R_1\nu_1) \bigcap B_{R_2}(x_0 + R_2\nu_2),$$

where ν_i is the unit inner normal vector of σ_i at x_0. Then, any $x \in \Omega_{x_0,\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2}$ near x_0 is uniquely determined by d_1, d_2, where $d_i(x)$ is the distance from x to $\partial B_{R_i}(R_i\nu_i)$. With such a one-to-one correspondence between $x \in \Omega_{x_0,\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2}$ near 0 and (d_1, d_2) with $d_1 > 0$ and $d_2 > 0$ small, we rewrite the solution of (1.1) for $\Omega = \Omega_{x_0,\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2}$ as

$$f_{x_0,\mu,R_1,R_2}(d_1, d_2). \tag{4.1}$$

We prove the following result in this section.

Theorem 4.1. *Let Ω be a bounded convex domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and, for some $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $R > 0$, let $\partial\Omega \cap B_R$ consist of two $C^{2,\alpha}$-curves σ_1 and σ_2 intersecting at x_0 at an angle $\mu\pi$, for some constants $\alpha, \mu \in (0,1)$. Assume the curvature κ_i of σ_i at x_0 is positive. Suppose $f \in C(\bar{\Omega}) \cap C^\infty(\Omega)$ is the solution of (1.1) in Ω. Then, for any $x \in \Omega$ close to x_0,*

$$|f(x) - f_{x_0,\mu,R_1,R_2}(d_1, d_2)| \le C f(x)|x - x_0|^\beta, \tag{4.2}$$

where d_i is the distance to σ_i, f_{x_0,μ,R_1,R_2} is the solution of (1.1) in $\Omega_{x_0,\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2}$ in terms of d_1 and d_2, β is a constant in $(0, \alpha/2]$, and C is a positive constant depending only on R, μ, α, and the $C^{2,\alpha}$-norms of σ_1 and σ_2 in $B_R(x_0)$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume $d_1 \le d_2$. Then,

$$d_2 \le |x - x_0| \le C d_2.$$

We consider two cases.

Case 1. We first consider the case $d_1 \ge |x - x_0|^{\frac{3}{2}}$. By Case 1 in the proof of Lemma 3.1, specifically (3.5), we have

$$f(x) = f_\mu(x)(1 + O(|x - x_0|^{\frac{1}{2}})), \tag{4.3}$$

where $f_\mu(x)$ is the corresponding solution of (1.1) on the tangent cone V_{x_0} of Ω at x_0. Let x^* be the unique point in $\Omega_{x_0,\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2}$ determined by d_1, d_2. Then,

$$|x^* - x| \le C|x - x_0|^{2+\alpha}.$$

Note that V_{x_0} is also the tangent cone of $\Omega_{x_0,\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2}$ at x_0. Hence,

$$f_{x_0,\mu,R_1,R_2}(d_1, d_2) = f_\mu(x^*)(1 + O(|x^* - x_0|^{\frac{1}{2}})).$$

By the mean value theorem and $\theta \ge |x - x_0|^{\frac{1}{2}}$, we get

$$|f_\mu(x) - f_\mu(x^*)| \le C|x - x_0|^{-\frac{1}{3}}|x - x_0|^{2+\alpha} \le C f_\mu(x)|x - x_0|^{\frac{1}{2}+\alpha}.$$

Therefore,

$$f(x) = f_{x_0,\mu,R_1,R_2}(d_1, d_2)(1 + O(|x - x_0|^{\frac{1}{2}})).$$

Case 2. We consider $d_1 \leq |x - x_0|^{\frac{3}{2}}$. Denote by p_i the point on σ_i closest to x and by ν_{p_i} the unit inner normal vector to σ_i at p_i. Set, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\widetilde{R}_i = R_i + |x - x_0|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \quad \widehat{R}_i = R_i - |x - x_0|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}},$$

and

$$\widetilde{\Omega} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{2} B_{\widetilde{R}_i}(p_i + \widetilde{R}_i \nu_{p_i}), \quad \widehat{\Omega} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{2} B_{\widehat{R}_i}(p_i + \widehat{R}_i \nu_{p_i}).$$

Let $\widetilde{f}, \widehat{f}$ be the solution of (1.1) for $\Omega = \widetilde{\Omega}, \widehat{\Omega}$, respectively.

For $|x - x_0|$ small, it is straightforward to verify

$$\Omega \bigcap B_{C_0|x-x_0|^{\frac{1}{2}}}(x_0) \subset \widetilde{\Omega}, \quad \widehat{\Omega} \bigcap B_{C_0|x-x_0|^{\frac{1}{2}}}(x_0) \subset \Omega.$$

If $|x - x_0|$ is small, $\partial B_{\widetilde{R}_1}(p_1 + \widetilde{R}_1 \nu_{p_1})$ and $\partial B_{\widetilde{R}_2}(p_2 + \widetilde{R}_2 \nu_{p_2})$ intersect at points $\widetilde{p}, \widetilde{q}$. Without loss of generality, we denote by $\widetilde{p}$ the point closer to x_0. Similarly, $\partial B_{\widehat{R}_1}(p_1 + \widehat{R}_1 \nu_{p_1})$ and $\partial B_{\widehat{R}_2}(p_2 + \widehat{R}_1 \nu_{p_2})$ intersect at points $\widehat{p}, \widehat{q}$. We denote by $\widehat{p}$ the point closer to x_0. It is easy to verify

$$|\widetilde{p} - x_0| \leq C|x - x_0|^2, \quad |\widehat{p} - x_0| \leq C|x - x_0|^2.$$

Hence,

$$\widehat{\Omega} \bigcap B_{C_0'|x-x_0|^{\frac{1}{2}}}(\widehat{p}) \subset \Omega.$$

Let $f', \widehat{f}'$ be the solution of (1.1) for $\Omega \bigcap B_{C_0|x-x_0|^{\frac{1}{2}}}(x_0)$, $\widehat{\Omega} \bigcap B_{C_0'|x-x_0|^{\frac{1}{2}}}(\widehat{p})$, respectively. By Lemma 3.1, we have

$$|f'(x) - f(x)| \leq Cf(x) \left(\frac{|x - x_0|}{C_0|x - x_0|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right)^{\tau} \leq Cf(x)|x - x_0|^{\frac{\tau}{2}},$$

and

$$|\widehat{f}'(x) - \widehat{f}(x)| \leq \widehat{f}(x) \left(\frac{|x - \widehat{p}|}{C_0|x - x_0|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right)^{\tau} \leq C\widehat{f}(x)|x - x_0|^{\frac{\tau}{2}},$$

where we took $r_0 = C_0|x - x_0|^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in (3.1). By the maximum principle, we have

$$f'(x) \leq \widetilde{f}(x), \quad \widehat{f}'(x) \leq f(x).$$

Hence,

$$\widehat{f}(x)(1 - C|x - x_0|^{\frac{\tau}{2}}) \leq f(x),$$
$$f(x)(1 - C|x - x_0|^{\frac{\tau}{2}}) \leq \widetilde{f}(x).$$

Therefore,

$$\widehat{f}(x)(1-C|x-x_0|^{\frac{\tau}{2}}) \le f(x) \le \widetilde{f}(x)(1+C|x-x_0|^{\frac{\tau}{2}}). \tag{4.4}$$

Let $\widetilde{\mu}\pi$ be the openning angle of the tangent cone of $\widetilde{\Omega}$ at $\widetilde{p}$ and $\widehat{\mu}\pi$ be the openning angle of the tangent cone of $\widehat{\Omega}$ at $\widehat{p}$. It is easy to check that

$$|\widetilde{\mu}-\mu| \le C|x-x_0|^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \quad |\widehat{\mu}-\mu| \le C|x-x_0|^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}. \tag{4.5}$$

We note that $\partial B_{R_1}(x_0+R_1\nu_1)$ and $\partial B_{R_2}(x_0+R_2\nu_2)$ intersect at two points, one of which is x_0 and another denoted by q. By Lemma 6.1 in [6] or calculating directly, we have

$$|x_0q| = \frac{2R_1R_2\sin(\pi-\mu\pi)}{\sqrt{R_1^2+R_2^2-2R_1R_2\cos(\pi-\mu\pi)}},$$

and similar formulas for $|\widehat{pq}|$ and $|\widetilde{pq}|$. Hence,

$$||\widehat{pq}|-|x_0q|| \le C|x-x_0|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}},$$
$$||\widetilde{pq}|-|x_0q|| \le C|x-x_0|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}.$$

We also note that in $\widetilde{\Omega}$, the distance of x to $\partial B_{\widetilde{R}_i}(x_0+\widetilde{R}_i\nu_{p_i})$ is d_i for $i=1,2$ and that in $\widehat{\Omega}$, the distance of x to $\partial B_{\widehat{R}_i}(x_0+\widehat{R}_i\nu_{p_i})$ is d_i for $i=1,2$. Hence,

$$\widetilde{f}(x) = f_{x_0,\widetilde{\mu},\widetilde{R}_1,\widetilde{R}_2}(d_1,d_2), \quad \widehat{f}(x) = f_{x_0,\widehat{\mu},\widehat{R}_1,\widehat{R}_2}(d_1,d_2).$$

Next, we will prove, for some constant γ,

$$\widetilde{f}(x) = f_{x_0,\mu,R_1,R_2}(d_1,d_2)(1+O(|x-x_0|^{\gamma})), \tag{4.6}$$

and

$$\widehat{f}(x) = f_{x_0,\mu,R_1,R_2}(d_1,d_2)(1+O(|x-x_0|^{\gamma})). \tag{4.7}$$

We have the desired result by combining (4.4), (4.6), and (4.7).

Set $\widetilde{L} = |\widetilde{pq}|/2$. By a translation and a rotation, we assume

$$\widetilde{p} = (-\widetilde{L},0), \quad \widetilde{q} = (\widetilde{L},0).$$

Then, $T_{\widetilde{L}}|_{\{x_3=0\}}$ transforms $\widetilde{\Omega}$ conformally to an infinite cone $V_{\widetilde{\mu}}$ and $T_{\widetilde{L}}$ transforms the minimal graph $\{(\widetilde{x}_1,\widetilde{f}(\widetilde{x}))\}$ with the asymptotic boundary $\partial\widetilde{\Omega}$ to the minimal graph $\{(\widetilde{y},f_{\widetilde{\mu}}(\widetilde{y}))\}$ with the asymptotic boundary $\partial V_{\widetilde{\mu}}$. With $x=(x_1,x_2)$, set $y=(y_1,y_2)$ such that $(y,f_{\widetilde{\mu}}(y)) = T_{\widetilde{L}}(x,\widetilde{f}(x))$. For brevity, set

$$T_{\widetilde{L},0} = T_{\widetilde{L}}|_{\{x_3=0\}}.$$

We have

$$\widetilde{f}(x) \le C|x-x_0|\left(\frac{|x-x_0|^{\frac{3}{2}}}{|x-x_0|}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \le C|x-x_0|^{\frac{7}{6}}.$$

Moreover,

$$JT_{\widetilde{L}}|_{(\widetilde{p},0)} = \frac{1}{2}I_{3\times3},$$

and

$$\widetilde{f}_\mu(y) = \frac{2\widetilde{L}^2\widetilde{f}(x)}{(x_1-\widetilde{L})^2+x_2^2+\widetilde{f}^2(x)} = \left(\frac{1}{2}+O(|x-x_0|)\right)\widetilde{f}(x),$$
$$(y_1,y_2) = \frac{(x_1-\widetilde{L})^2+x_2^2}{(x_1-\widetilde{L})^2+x_2^2+\widetilde{f}^2(x)}T_{\widetilde{L},0}(x_1,x_2) - \frac{\widetilde{L}(\widetilde{f}^2(x),0)}{(x_1-\widetilde{L})^2+x_2^2+\widetilde{f}^2(x)}.$$

Set

$$\widetilde{l}_1 = T_{\widetilde{L},0}(\partial B_{\widetilde{R}_1}(p_1+\widetilde{R}_1\nu_{p_1})),$$

and write, for a unique vector $e_{\widetilde{l}_1}$,

$$\partial V_{\widetilde{\mu}} \bigcap \widetilde{l}_1 = \{te_{\widetilde{l}_1} \mid t \geq 0\}.$$

By the definition of d_1, we have

$$\mathrm{dist}(x, \partial B_{\widetilde{R}_1}(p_1+\widetilde{R}_1\nu_{p_1})) = d_1.$$

Hence,

$$\mathrm{dist}(T_{\widetilde{L},0}(x), \widetilde{l}_1) = \left(\frac{1}{2}+O(|x-x_0|)\right)d_1.$$

A simple geometric argument yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{dist}(y,\widetilde{l}_1) &= (1+O(|x-x_0|))\mathrm{dist}(T_{\widetilde{L},0}(x),\widetilde{l}_1)\\ &\quad - \frac{\widetilde{L}\widetilde{f}^2}{(x_1-\widetilde{L})^2+x_2^2+\widetilde{f}^2}\sin\angle(\frac{\overrightarrow{\widetilde{p}\widetilde{q}}}{|\widetilde{p}\widetilde{q}|}, e_{\widetilde{l}_1})\\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2}+O(|x-x_0|)\right)d_1 - (1+O(|x-x_0|))\frac{\widetilde{f}^2}{4\widetilde{R}_1},\end{aligned}$$

or

$$(1+O(|x-x_0|))d_1 = (2+O(|x-x_0|))\frac{\widetilde{f}^2}{4\widetilde{R}_1} + 2\mathrm{dist}(y,\widetilde{l}_1).$$

Write $\langle y, e_{\widetilde{l}_1}\rangle = |y|\cos\theta$. By (2.22), we have

$$\frac{\mathrm{dist}(y,\widetilde{l}_1)}{\langle y, e_{\widetilde{l}_1}\rangle} = a_{\widetilde{\mu}}\left(\frac{f_{\widetilde{\mu}}}{\langle y, e_{\widetilde{l}_1}\rangle}\right)^3 + O\left(\left(\frac{f_{\widetilde{\mu}}}{\langle y, e_{\widetilde{l}_1}\rangle}\right)^4\right).$$

We point out that the left-hand side is simply $\tan\theta$. The presence of the factor $\langle y, e_{\widetilde{l}_1}\rangle$ in the right-hand side is due to a scaling since (2.22) is expanded at $(r,\theta)=(1,0)$. Note that

$$\langle y, e_{\widetilde{l}_1}\rangle = |y|\cos\theta = (1+O(|x-x_0|))|y| = \left(\frac{1}{2}+O(|x-x_0|)\right)|x-x_0|.$$

Hence,

$$(1+O(|x-x_0|))d_1 = \frac{1}{4\widetilde{R}_1}(2+O(|x-x_0|))\widetilde{f}^2 + [a_{\widetilde{\mu}}+O(|x-x_0|^{\frac{1}{6}})](1+O(|x-x_0|))\frac{\widetilde{f}^3}{|x-x_0|^2},$$

where we substituted $f_{\widetilde{\mu}}$ by $\widetilde{f}$. By Lemma 2.7, we have

$$|a_{\widetilde{\mu}} - a_\mu| \le C|x-x_0|^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}},$$

and hence

$$(1+O(|x-x_0|))d_1 = \frac{1}{4R_1}(2+O(|x-x_0|))(1+O(|x-x_0|)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}})\widetilde{f}^2(x) + [a_\mu+O(|x-x_0|^{\frac{1}{6}})]\frac{\widetilde{f}^3(x)}{|x-x_0|^2},$$

where we used the relation between R_1 and $\widetilde{R}_1$. A similar argument holds for f_{x_0,μ,R_1,R_2} as defined in $\Omega = \Omega_{x_0,\mu,\kappa_1,\kappa_2}$. Then,

$$(1+O(|x-x_0|))d_1 = \frac{1}{4R_1}(2+O(|x-x_0|))f_{x_0,\mu,R_1,R_2}(d_1,d_2)^2 + [a_\mu+O(|x-x_0|^{\frac{1}{6}})]\frac{f_{x_0,\mu,R_1,R_2}(d_1,d_2)^3}{|x-x_0|^2}.$$

Hence,

$$\widetilde{f}(x) = f_{x_0,\mu,R_1,R_2}(d_1,d_2)(1+O(|x-x_0|^\gamma)),$$

where $\gamma = \min\{\frac{\alpha}{2}, \frac{1}{6}\}$. This implies (4.6). We can prove (4.7) similarly. □

Remark 4.2. If $\alpha \le \min\{\tau, 1/3\}$, then we can take $\beta = \alpha/2$. See (4.4), (4.6), and (4.7).

We are ready to prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We adopt the notations from Theorem 4.1 and its proof. Without loss of generality, we assume x_0 is the origin. For any x sufficiently small, we define

$$T_{\{\sigma_i\}}x = (d_1(x), d_2(x)),$$

where $d_i(x)$ is the signed distance from x to σ_i with respect to ν_i, $i = 1, 2$, positive if x is on the side of ν_i and negative if on another side. Refer to [6] for details. We emphasize that $T_{\{\sigma_i\}}$ is defined in a full neighborhood of the origin instead of only in Ω and that the signed distance is used instead of its absolute value. Then, $T_{\{\sigma_i\}}$ is $C^{2,\alpha}$ near the origin and its Jacobi matrix at the origin is nonsingular by the linear independence of ν_1 and ν_2. Therefore, $T_{\{\sigma_i\}}$ is a $C^{2,\alpha}$-diffeormorphism in a neighborhood of the origin. We have a similar result for $T_{\{\partial B_{R_i}(R_i\nu_i)\}}$, with $\partial B_{R_i}(R_i\nu_i)$ replacing σ_i, $i = 1, 2$. Then, the map $T = T^{-1}_{\{\partial B_{R_i}(R_i\nu_i)\}} \circ T_{\{\sigma_i\}}$ is a $C^{2,\alpha}$-diffeomorphism near the origin and has the property that the signed distance from x to σ_i is the same as that from Tx to $\partial B_{R_i}(R_i\nu_i)$, for $i = 1, 2$. Therefore, Theorem 1.1 follows from Theorem 4.1. □

References

[1] M. Anderson, *Complete minimal varieties in hyperbolic space*, Invent. Math., 69(1982), 477-494.

[2] M. Anderson, *Complete minimal hypersurfaces in hyperbolic n-manifolds*, Comment. Math. Helv., 58(1983), 264-290.

[3] D. Gilbarg, N. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, Springer, Berlin, 1983.

[4] Q. Han, X. Jiang, *Boundary expansions for minimal graphs in the hyperbolic space*, arXiv:1412.7608.

[5] Q. Han, W. Shen, *Boundary expansions for Liouville's equation in planar singular domains*, arXiv:1511.01149v1.

[6] Q. Han, W. Shen, *The Loewner-Nirenberg problem in singular domains*, arXiv:1511.01146v1.

[7] Q. Han, W. Shen,Y. Wang, *Optimal regularity of minimal graphs in the hyperbolic space*, Calc. Var. & Partial Differential Equations, to appear.

[8] R. Hardt, F.-H. Lin, *Regularity at infinity for area-minimizing hypersurfaces in hyperbolic space*, Invent. Math., 88(1987), 217-224.

[9] A. Kennington, *Power concavity and boundary value problems*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 34(1985), 687-704.

[10] F.-H. Lin, *Asymptotic behavior of area-minimizing currents in hyperbolic space*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 42(1989), 229-242.

[11] F.-H. Lin, *On the Dirichlet problem for minimal graphs in hyperbolic space*, Invent. Math., 96(1989), 593-612.

[12] D. Serre, *Multidimensional shock interaction for a Chaplygin gas*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 191(2009), 539-577.

Beijing International Center for Mathematical Research, Peking University, Beijing, 100871, China
E-mail address: qhan@math.pku.edu.cn

Department of Mathematics, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA
E-mail address: qhan@nd.edu

School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, Beijing, 100871, China
E-mail address: wmshen@pku.edu.cn

School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, Beijing, 100871, China
E-mail address: 1201110027@pku.edu.cn